
Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 6 November 2018 and 30 April 2019

Site visit made on 30 April 2019

by D Fleming BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/C/17/3190135

Land adjacent to Stablewood Farm, The Lakes, Swanmore, Southampton S032 2PR

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William Hughes against an enforcement notice issued by Winchester City Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 10 November 2017.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the material change of use of the Land from agricultural use to use as a residential caravan site, together with ancillary operational/engineering development.
 - The requirements of the notice are
 - i. Cease the use of the Land as a residential caravan site,
 - ii. Remove from the Land all caravans (static/mobile homes and touring caravans), vehicles and trailers, and all residential and domestic paraphernalia,
 - iii. Dig up and remove the hard standing, rubble and gravel from the Land,
 - iv. Remove from the Land all resultant waste,
 - v. Remove the water supply and drainage from the Land and refill the resulting holes following removal of the water supply and drainage,
 - vi. Remove the electrical supply including cables and other electrical installations from the Land,
 - vii. Return the land to its previous condition and appearance as agricultural land that is clear, level and seeded to grass after compliance with steps (i) to (iv).
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is steps (i) and (ii): one month; step (iii) to (vi): two months; and step (vii): three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected: by the substitution of the plan annexed to this decision for the plan attached to the enforcement notice; by the deletion of the words "together with ancillary operational/engineering development" and the substitution of the words "and the provision of hard standing and drainage" in paragraph 3 of the notice.
2. Subject to these corrections, the appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed. Planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the land from agricultural use to use as a residential caravan site and the provision of hard standing and drainage on the land shown edged and hatched black on

the plan annexed to this decision, subject to the conditions in the schedule attached to this decision.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by the Council against the appellant. This application will be the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

4. The Hearing initially opened on 6 November 2018. In clarifying which documents I had received during the opening of the Hearing, it transpired that the appellant was seeking to rely on a Statement of Case produced for a section 78 appeal¹ that was turned away as being out of time. As this was not before me or the Council, the Hearing was adjourned to allow time for it to be submitted for this appeal so that myself and the Council were aware of the appellant's case. The Hearing then re-opened on 30 April 2019.
5. The reasons for issuing the notice refer to the draft Winchester District: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Development Plan Document (Traveller DPD), which was at the consultation stage at the time the notice was issued. Following an Examination in Public, the DPD was adopted, after modification, on 28 February 2019. I will have regard to the adopted policies within it in reaching my decision.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) current at the time when the notice was issued was that of 2012. By the time of the Hearing this had been revised as the 2018 publication. A further revision was published on the 19th of February 2019, but this did not alter any matters or references related to this decision.

The Notice

7. A notice must enable every person who receives a copy to know exactly what, in the Council's view, constitutes the breach of planning control. In this case, the notice includes the phrase "together with ancillary operational/engineering development" within the allegation, which is imprecise, and includes an area of land that is far larger and outwith the ownership of the appellant than the area of land where the breach of planning control has occurred.
8. It is open to me to correct the allegation in the notice so that it includes the hard standing and drainage installed by the appellant, and correct the boundary of the site shown on the plan. I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused by this as both parties deal with it in their submissions and the site area will be smaller. I will therefore correct the notice in order to clarify the terms of the deemed application under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended. I will proceed on the basis that the description of the development is the material change of use of the land from agricultural use to use as a residential caravan site and the provision of hard standing and drainage.
9. The Council also identify the site as "Land adjacent to Stablewood Farm" but at the Hearing the appellant confirmed that the pitches on the site are now known as Nos 1 and 2 Willow Park. Although the Council advise that these addresses are not registered with Royal Mail, both parties agreed it would be more

¹ Planning application submitted May 2016 for two mobile homes, two touring caravans and a utility block for two gypsy families on the same land attacked by the notice

accurate to refer to Willow Park in order to correctly identify the site. This can also be corrected without causing injustice.

10. The appellant claimed that the notice was a nullity on the basis that the allegation was not specific and that the reasons for issuing the notice were inadequate. The reasons referred to the development proposed in the planning application the subject of the late appeal, not the development the subject of the notice. I have found that this is not the case as the allegation is capable of correction. Whilst the reasons do refer to the planning application, they also cover why the Council consider it expedient to issue the notice and set out the relevant policies, as required by the Town and Country Planning (Enforcement Notices and Appeals)(England) Regulations 2002.

Preliminary Matters

11. At the site visit I saw that the rectangular site is divided into two pitches, with one behind the other, and is occupied without planning permission by members of the gypsy and traveller community.

The ground (a) appeal and the deemed planning application

Main Issue

12. The main issue is whether the development represents an acceptable form of development having regard to the following matters:
- the objectives of the development plan in respect of gypsy and traveller accommodation;
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether any harm arising from the above matters, is outweighed by any other material considerations.

Reasons

Appropriateness of development – site location

13. The appeal site is situated midway along and on the south side of an unmade single track road known as The Lakes. The track is aligned approximately on an east-west axis and connects New Road in the west to Hill Pound in the east, which are rural roads leading into the village of Swanmore to the north. The fields on the south side of The Lakes are part of the defined settlement gap between Swanmore and neighbouring villages as set out in Policy CP18 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1- Joint Core Strategy, adopted March 2013, (LP1). The fields on the north side of The Lakes, bar one, (identified as being a nature reserve²) are allocated for housing development including the Belmont Farm complex.
14. There are a handful of permanent dwellings along The Lakes including Belmont Farm to the north west of the appeal site and Buena Vista and Woodside Manor to the east. In addition, there are also gypsy families living on the western side of the appeal site and directly to the south west. These sites are known as Barn Farm (five pitches) and Stablewood Farm (one pitch). These sites are

² Belmont Meadows Site of Importance for Nature Conservation

safeguarded, as gypsy and traveller sites, from alternative development in the Traveller DPD (Policy TR1).

15. Given the location of the appeal site in the settlement gap, it is undoubtedly within the countryside. Policy MTRA4 of the LP1 restricts development in the countryside to that which has an operational need for a rural location such as agriculture, the reuse of rural buildings for employment, the expansion of buildings to meet business needs, provided development is proportionate, and low key tourist accommodation.
16. Policy CP5 from the LP1 sets out the criteria for the development of gypsy and traveller sites. It states that they should be well related to existing communities for social inclusion and sustainable patterns of living but not over concentrated in any one location or disproportionate in size to nearby communities, amongst other matters.
17. Policy DM4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, Development Management and Site Allocations (LP2) adopted April 2017, sets out planning permission will be given for gypsy and traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs identified for the area, which is envisaged to be about 15 pitches.
18. New Policy TR6 of the Traveller DPD deals with proposals for traveller accommodation outside safeguarded sites and sites with temporary planning permission. These will only be permitted where there is a lack of other suitable accommodation and in sustainable locations, well related to existing communities, amongst other criteria.
19. National policy is contained in Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) which states that applications should be assessed and determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. In addition, Councils should very strictly limit new traveller site development in the open countryside that is away from existing settlements.
20. The appellant submits that there is a significant unmet need for pitches in the district not identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. In particular, there is a difference between assessed need and actual need and the new Traveller DPD does not take into account non-travelling gypsy and traveller persons. He also submits that the appeal site is an expansion of Barn Farm, which is part of a safeguarded site. However, while this is his perception, in that he continues to live 'next door' to his mother at Barn Farm, Policy TR5 of the Traveller DPD sets out the expansion of safeguarded sites will be considered within the existing boundaries of those sites. As such, the appeal site is a stand-alone site with its own access off The Lakes.
21. I find the appellant's submissions on need overlook the fact that the new Traveller DPD includes a new Policy TR6. The content of this policy was not present in any part of the Council's development plan and it is necessary in order to provide a framework for the consideration of unidentified sites that may come forward for development in the rural area, such as the appeal site.
22. Prior to this, the Council's approach to planning for the travelling community was to meet just the identified accommodation needs by safeguarding existing sites, allowing their expansion, subject to detailed considerations, and regularising existing sites with temporary planning permission.

23. The supporting text to Policy TR6 sets out that there may be cases where an exception to restrictions on development in the countryside may be justified. This could be to meet the remaining needs of the traveller community with a need to be located in the area. Where these people meet the definition of travellers but have not been able to find a suitable site within a settlement boundary, permission may be granted for a suitable site in the countryside. As part of the consideration for such a scenario there should be evidence to show that sites within settlement boundaries have been sought and why these are not suitable or available. In addition, the site under consideration should be in a sustainable location. I will deal with these matters as part of my consideration of the requirements of Policy TR6.
24. In the first instance Policy TR6 stipulates that sites in rural areas will only be permitted where they are for the occupation by the gypsy and traveller community, as identified in the PPTS. There is no disagreement between the parties that the families³ occupying the appeal site meet that definition in that they are persons of a nomadic habit of life. Although born elsewhere, the appellant and his sister have lived in the district for over 30 years, attending local schools. The appellant's mother has lived at Barn Farm for 17 years and his sister has lived at Barn Farm for the last 6 years. They are 2 of 17 siblings raised on Barn Farm where his mother, and some siblings who work with the appellant, still live.
25. It is also necessary for the appellant to demonstrate a personal or cultural need to be located in the area. I find that the appellant and his sister fulfil this criteria as this neighbourhood is their home and has been for a significant period of time. Although the appellant and his brother-in-law (his sister's partner) travel extensively for work purposes, Swanmore is the area they return to as their base. Two of the appellant's nieces have also married into the settled community of Swanmore and his sister's children attend a local school and church.
26. In addition, the appellant needs to demonstrate that there is a lack of other suitable accommodation. No detailed information was provided by him as to sites sought within settlement boundaries, other than a general remark that sites that do become available are unaffordable. He has never lived in 'bricks and mortar' but he was on the waiting list, when the Council used to have one, for one of the pitches on Tynefield⁴, when it was a publicly owned gypsy and traveller site, as his aunt used to live there. The site is now privately owned and planning permission has been given for 19 pitches but, to date, the site has not been refurbished to accommodate these. The appellant's sister visited the site and found that it was in disarray, with no fencing between the pitches; it was therefore unsuitable.
27. The appellant submits that Tynefield is not deliverable⁵ as the site owner does not want the pitches to be widely available and that the two pitches that are occupied on the site are occupied by the site owner's family. Notwithstanding that this information is unsubstantiated, the Council were firmly of the view that the site is deliverable as it has a site licence and meets minimum requirements. In addition, the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of

³ The appellant and his partner on No 1 Willow Park and the appellant's sister, her partner and four children at No 2 Willow Park

⁴ Tynefield Caravan Site, near Fareham

⁵ PPTS footnote No 4

gypsy and traveller sites of which 18 pitches have already been delivered in the development plan.

28. It appears that many of the 'delivered' pitches comprise the regularisation of temporary planning permissions, including the 5 pitches at Barn Farm. These, and other like pitches, are not available to the appellant. Similarly, there is no access to other authorised and safeguarded sites by means of expansion as these generally are for the benefit of the existing families on those sites. On the basis of the information before me, it is therefore concluded that there is a lack of other suitable accommodation for the appellant and his sister.
29. This brings me to a consideration of whether the appeal site is in a sustainable location and whether it is in accordance with the requirements of Policy CP5 of the LP1 and Policy TR6 of the Traveller DPD. Whilst the site is in the countryside, it is not away from an existing settlement in PPTS terms as it is within walking distance of Swanmore, with schools, a church and a shop along New Road. There is also a bus stop near the junction of The Lakes with New Road, though it is not known whether the level of service is more than just to serve the students attending the secondary school opposite. Although the appellant's sister collects her children on foot from school, she takes them by car in the morning. Given the rough unmade surface of The Lakes, the lack of street lighting and the small size of the village, it is likely that most trips are made by car. This is not unlike the settled community who would need to make use of a car to travel further afield for health care and other requirements. As the site is within a reasonable distance of Swanmore, I find no conflict with Policy CP5 or TR6 in respect of the site being well related to the local community. I therefore give this finding substantial weight.

Character and appearance

30. The rural area in the vicinity of the appeal site is former heathland sub divided into small fields used as paddocks and small holdings. The land is gently undulating and the fields are enclosed with hedgerows. The area has no specific landscape designation in the LP1 other than as a settlement gap wherein Policy CP18 sets out that the Council will retain the undeveloped nature of the defined settlement gaps and will only allow development that does not physically or visually diminish the gap.
31. A public right of way runs along The Lakes, which is part of a long distance path known as The Kings Way. Policy DM15 of the LP2 sets out that development should respect the characteristics that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area and that regard will be had to the cumulative effects of development on the character of an area. Policy DM23 of the LP2 also deals with the effect of development in a rural area on rural character and requires the consideration of visual factors, amongst other matters. In particular, Policy CP5 requires that sites should not be unduly intrusive and any built structures should be restricted to essential facilities, such as a small amenity block amongst other requirements that overlap with Policies CP18, DM15 and DM23.
32. The appeal site is rectangular in shape with a short northern side adjacent to The Lakes track. There is hedging across the site frontage as well as a solid fence and a metal field gate. However, the fence is set well back from the edge of the track as there is a stream running beside the track in between the site and the track.

33. The appeal site is level with mature hedging and trees on the east and west boundaries and a new solid fence along the southern boundary. The access is in the north west corner of the site adjacent to the boundary with Barn Farm. The spacious pitches are laid out in a tandem fashion and separated by fencing. There is a static home on pitch No 1 sited parallel to The Lakes and adjacent to that there is a small day room and a shed providing the electrical hook-up point. There are two tourers on pitch No 2 and plenty of space to develop the site to an acceptable standard. All of the ground area has been developed as a hard standing with hardcore laid on top of the grass and a layer of shingle applied as the finishing layer.
34. The Council are concerned that the use of the land as a residential caravan site has had an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the landscape. In particular, it contributes towards creating an urban fringe character and erodes the settlement gap.
35. When viewed simply on a plan, the erosion point can be seen but when viewed on the ground the appeal site is well hidden and the erosion point is not well made. Although when passing along The Lakes on foot or by car it is possible to see into the site, this view is momentary and is replaced with a view of hedging after passing the narrow access point and the gate. If I were minded to allow the appeal, a condition could be imposed requiring a reduction in the extent of the hard surfaced area within the site and the addition of more natural screening, especially along the southern boundary, to soften the appearance of the solid fence. There is a public right of way near the entrance to Woodside Manor that connects The Lakes public right of way to housing in the village and runs alongside the nature reserve. It is on a slight incline but anyone using the path would not be able to see the appeal site due to its location in a dip and the level of natural screening. There are no other public rights of way in the area but from further afield when looking across the settlement gap from either New Road, Hill Pound or Gravel Hill it is not possible to see the appeal site due to the lie of the land and intervening hedgerows and trees.
36. There are two developments though that are visible from The Lakes and the surrounding area. Adjoining Woodside Manor within the settlement gap, it appears that two detached houses are currently being built. These were referred to by the appellant at the Hearing but the Council were unable to provide any background information. The second development is a new small housing estate at the eastern end of The Lakes, which occupies some of the land allocated for development in the LP1. It has been well laid out with paths connecting to the public right of way leading to The Lakes and hedging kept on all three boundaries but nevertheless it is a prominent development adjacent to The Lakes and the settlement gap.
37. I therefore find the Council's argument regarding the appeal site adding to the creation of an urban fringe character is unsubstantiated. The use of the appeal site does not physically or visually diminish the settlement gap and accordingly there is no conflict with Policy CP18. The enjoyment of the long distance path is also preserved and thus there is no conflict with Policy DM23.
38. I turn now to consider the cumulative effect of the development. The general character and appearance of the landscape in the vicinity of the appeal site is already that of a patchwork of small fields with sporadic built form comprising a

mixture of dwellings, stables and farm buildings. The modest built form on the appeal site is not at odds with this pattern. Furthermore, the location of the appeal site adjacent to two authorised sites does not result in an over concentration given the size of the settlement of Swanmore. In addition, no evidence was put forward to substantiate an argument that the use of the appeal site places an unreasonable burden on local services. The Council are concerned that the integrity of the landscape character is significantly undermined by the use of the site given the piecemeal development that has already taken place in the area. Whilst there is now a residential use where none existed previously, it is my view this results in a modest impact on the character and appearance of the area. The harm is limited but not significant due to the level of existing screening.

39. Overall, I conclude on this issue that the development does not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, subject to the imposition of the conditions as discussed. As such, this aspect of the development is in accordance with Policies CP5, CP18, DM15 and DM23 and as such, attracts substantial weight.

Other matters

40. All gypsy and traveller sites should also comply with the specific design criteria for the layout of such sites set out in Policy TR7 from the Traveller DPD and Policy CP5 from LP1. There are no objections from the Council's highway team to the design of the access into the site, the space for a turning area within the site or the use of The Lakes track to reach the site. There is space within the site that could be set aside for a children's play area and a condition could be imposed to secure this. The appellant has already organised that waste is collected by the waste disposal service and there is an area within the site to store refuse bins.
41. The appeal site lies adjacent to a tributary of the River Hamble, within Flood Zone 3 (FZ3). The appellant has not provided either a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) or any plans which set out what to do in a flooding incident. The Council's Drainage officer has minor concerns over surface water drainage, significant concerns over the resilience of the site to flooding and significant to major concerns over foul drainage. Policy CP17 of the LP1 seeks to ensure that people and property are protected from flood risk, where possible, and to manage any residual risk through location, layout and design.
42. As the site lies within FZ3, it is necessary to assess the development using the sequential test set out in the Framework. Table 2 of the Flooding and Coastal Change chapter of the Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) sets out the flood risk vulnerability classification of various developments and identifies caravans and mobile homes intended for permanent residential use as being highly vulnerable.
43. During the Hearing there was discussion on the availability of alternative accommodation for the appellant. Alternative sites must be available, affordable, acceptable and suitable. In addition, to be available, a pitch must have planning permission, be vacant and be actually available to the proposed occupier.
44. The Council suggested that there was availability in Eastleigh which the appellant identified as Kanes Hill, a Council owned caravan site. However,

there is a waiting list for places, as confirmed by the appellant's friend, who has been on the list for 18 months, it is therefore not available. Tynefield is also not available as previously discussed in paragraphs 27 and 28.

45. On the basis of the limited evidence before me therefore, it is concluded that it is not possible for the development to be located in a zone with a low risk of flooding. Although Table 3 within the Guidance states if the flood risk vulnerability classification is "Highly vulnerable", then development should not be permitted in FZ3, I am persuaded that the development at the appeal site could be made acceptable. This is because the Drainage officer states his concerns could be overcome with proper solutions. In addition, a FRA could show how the development could be made resilient to flooding.
46. I am reassured that the development could be made acceptable as the Council has chosen to safeguard the adjoining pitches, which also lie within FZ3, after a Site Assessment Methodology which identified flooding as a constraint.⁶ The Council have also identified the adjoining sites as an appropriate area where additional pitches may be provided through intensification.⁷ As such, I am also satisfied that the development at the appeal site would not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere.
47. To summarise, it is my view that the use of the site is justified given my finding that there is a lack of other suitable accommodation. The development provides wider sustainability benefits in terms of the provision of homes for everyone, in order to achieve balanced and integrated communities. The omission of details regarding waste water infrastructure and surface water drainage, together with details of a FRA and flood protection could be dealt with through the imposition of appropriate conditions. In particular, it will be necessary to demonstrate how the matters listed (a) to (e) in paragraph 163 of the Framework would be addressed. As the use of the site could be made safe for its lifetime in the event of flooding, the development therefore accords with Policy CP17.

Planning balance

48. I have found no conflict with the development plan read as a whole. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan. Within their submissions and at the Hearing the parties addressed other material considerations including the need for gypsy and traveller sites, personal circumstances, Human Rights and equality considerations. These are not matters that I need to address as I have concluded that the proposal accords with the development plan. The appeal on ground (a) therefore succeeds and the appeal on ground (g) does not therefore need to be considered.

Conditions

49. I have considered the need for the conditions put forward by the Council in the light of the advice in the Guidance and the discussion at the Hearing. Having regard to my findings on the development plan, I do not consider that it is necessary for temporary permission to be granted. It is, nonetheless, necessary to restrict the occupation of the site to gypsies and travellers.

⁶ Appendix E, Traveller DPD

⁷ Such proposals would be considered on a case by case basis and in accordance with Policy TR7.

50. In the interests of the appearance of the site it is necessary to limit the number of caravans, control lighting, prevent commercial activities on the land and the stationing/storage of vehicles over 3.5 tonnes.
51. At the Hearing there was some discussion between the parties regarding the removal of permitted development rights. It is my view in the interests of the appearance of the site that this would be necessary in relation to means of enclosure.
52. As the material change of use has already occurred, it will also be necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of a Site Development Scheme, in the interests of the appearance of the site. The condition is drafted in such a way as to require the appellant to comply with a strict timetable.
53. The condition is drafted in this particular form because, unlike an application for planning permission for development yet to commence, in the case of a retrospective grant of permission it is not possible to use a negatively worded condition precedent to secure the subsequent approval and implementation of outstanding detailed matters as the development has already taken place. The condition therefore provides for the loss of the effective benefit of the grant of planning permission where the detailed matters in question are not submitted for approval during the time set by the condition, approved (either by the local planning authority or by the Secretary of State on appeal), and then implemented in accordance with an approved timetable. Should the requirements of the condition not be met in line with the strict timetable, then the planning permission falls away.

Conclusion

54. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a) and I will grant planning permission in accordance with the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, which will now relate to the corrected allegation.

D Fleming

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr B Wood	Agent
Mr A Masters	Of Counsel
Mr W Hughes	Appellant
Ms M Hughes	Appellant's relative
Ms V Fury	Appellant's relative

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms S Castle	Principal Planning Officer
Ms S Newman	Planning Enforcement Officer

DOCUMENTS:

Copy of the Council's second
letter of notification dated 10
April 2019

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August 2015, (or any subsequent definition that supersedes that document).
- 2) No more than four caravans, as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended, shall be stationed on the site at any one time, of which no more than two shall be a static caravan, and no further caravans shall be placed at any time anywhere within the site.
- 3) No external lighting shall be put in place or operated on the site at any time other than has been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 4) No vehicles over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed parked or stored on this site.
- 5) No commercial activity shall take place on the land including the storage of materials.
- 6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting or amending that Order) no additional gates, walls or fences or other means of enclosure including bunding, shall be erected or placed within/to the boundaries of the site.
- 7) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place within 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (v) below:
 - (i) Within 3 months of the date of this Decision, submit details of
 - a) the internal layout of the site, hereafter referred to as the Site Development Scheme (SDS), including the layout of the pitches on the site, the siting of the approved caravans, play area, vehicular parking and manoeuvring areas;
 - b) Details of fencing and other means of enclosure, hard and soft landscaping for the northern and southern boundaries, including the retention of the native hedge along The Lakes, and including details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers, and densities and measures for their protection and retention;
 - c) Details of the location, size and appearance of the amenity block and shed; and the location and details of any storage provision;
 - d) Details of foul and surface water drainage, flood risk assessment and flood protection;
 - e) Details of waste disposal including collection point and storage areas.

The SDS shall have been submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority and shall include a timetable for its implementation.

- (ii) Within 11 months of the date of this decision the SDS should have been approved by the Local Planning Authority or, if the Local Planning Authority refuse to approve the SDS or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal should have been made to and accepted as validly made by the Secretary of State.

- (iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal should have been finally determined and the submitted SDS should have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - (iv) The approved SDS shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.
- 8) The works comprised in the SDS pursuant to condition 7 shall be retained for the duration of the use of the site and development.

END

Plan

This is the plan referred to in my decision dated: 10 July 2019

by D Fleming BA (Hons) MRTPI

Land at: Land at Nos 1 and 2 Willow Park, (formerly known as Land adjacent to Stablewood Farm) The Lakes, Swanmore, Southampton S032 2PR

Reference: APP/L1765/C/17/3190135

Scale:nts

